

Remarks

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action of **January 6, 2005**. Reexamination and reconsideration of **claims 1-9 and 18-24** are respectfully requested.

Summary of The Office Action

Claims 1, 18, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,049,796 issued to Siitonen et al.

Claims 2-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siitonen as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Patent Number 6,304,898 issued to Shiigi.

Claims 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siitonen as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Shiigi.

Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siitonen as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Shiigi.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siitonen, in view of Shiigi, as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Pat. No. 6,609, 121 issued to Ambrosini et al.

Claims 19, 20 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siitonen, as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Shiigi.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siitonen, as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Ambrosini.

The Present Claims Patentably Distinguish Over the References of Record

Claims 1, 18, and 23

Claims 1, 18, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,049,796 issued to Siitonen et al.

Independent claim 1 recites retrieving at least one destination address from a user's personal database stored remotely from said communications device. Independent claim 18 recites means for accessing a personal database stored remotely from said communications device to retrieve the at least one specified address. Siitonen et al. fail to teach or suggest the claimed features of claims 1 or 18 since Siitonen teaches a contact data base 11, 18 that is local to a personal digital assistant (PDA).

In particular, Siitonen describes that the PDA includes a contact data base 18 within a contact data base storage 11 that is contained by the PDA and thus is not remote. For example, Siitonen states:

“A PDA capable of carrying out the objects of the invention is comprised of a storage device containing a data base with one or more records of names and relatable calling numbers...” (column 3, lines 1-3).

Figure 1 of Siitonen shows that the contact data base 18 and the contact data base storage device 11 are included as part of PDA unit 10b. The Office Action on page 3 cites various sections of Siitonen for teaching a remote contact database. Applicant has reviewed these sections and finds no indication of a remote contact database. Siitonen accesses information from a local database 18 as previously explained and thus the PDA has no need to access a remote database. Furthermore, there is no mention of such a feature indicating that Siitonen did not consider and does not suggest such a feature.

Additionally, it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Siitonen to be able to access a remotely located personal database. The purpose of Siitonen is to improve searching response times in a PDA (column 1, lines 42-44). Also, “An object of this invention is

to provide an efficient method for searching a PDA database.” (column 3, lines 40-41). Searching a contact database from a remote location would certainly increase response times for searches. Therefore, such a modification to Siittonen would destroy the purpose and intent of the invention, and thus would be not be obvious under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Therefore, Siittonen fails to teach or suggest retrieving addresses from a personal database remote from the communications device as recited in claim 1. Likewise, Siittonen fails to teach or suggest a means for accessing a personal database stored remotely from a communications device as recited in claim 18. Thus, the §102 rejection is not supported by Siittonen and should be removed.

Since claims 1 and 18 recites features not taught or suggested by the references, claims 1 and 18 patentably distinguish over the reference. Accordingly, claims 2-9 (dependent from claim 1) and claims 19-23 (dependent from claim 18) also patentably distinguish over the references and are in condition for allowance.

Dependent claim 23 has been amended to recite that the communications device is a printer or a multifunctional product comprising a facsimile. Siittonen describes a personal digital assistant, which is a portable computer. Siittonen does not described the claimed device being a printer or a multifunctional product comprising a facsimile. For this additional reason, claim 23 patentably distinguishes over Siittonen.

New Claims 25 and 26

The features of claims 25 and 26 are supported, for example, by at least paragraph [0020] of the specification and Figures 1 and 3. Thus, no new matter has been added. The references fail to teach or suggest the claimed multifunctional device.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, **claims 1-9 and 18-26** patentably and unobviously distinguish over the references of record and are now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Petar Kraguljac", is written over a horizontal line.

PETAR KRAGULJAC (Reg. No. 38,520)

(216) 348-5843